APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/758,180	01/15/2004	Abdelsalam G. Helal	5853-302-1	5596

30448   7590   11/12/2008
AKERMAN SENTERFITT
P.O. BOX 3188
WEST PALM BEACH, FL 33402-3188

EXAMINER
WANG, JUE S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2193	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/12/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _30 July 2008_.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-39_ is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) _1-39_ is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on _15 January 2004_ is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some *   c) ☐ None of:
      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-39 have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 1, 4, 7, 9, 11, 13, 14, 17, 19, 22, 23, 26, 28, 31, 32, 35, and 37 are rejected under

35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blaukopf et al., (US 2004/0103407 A1, hereinafter

Blaukopf), in view of Sun Microsystems, "Java Platform 1.2 API Specification: Class

DatagramPacket" (hereinafter Sun).

4.   As per claim 1, Blaukopf teaches the invention as claimed, including an integrated

development tool for constructing a server-side proxy for interacting with a wireless, mobile

device (see Fig 1, Fig 2, [0016]), said integrated development tool comprising:

        a combination of computer hardware and software, including a processor (see [0074],

[0075]);

        at least one module, wherein said at least one module is configured to execute upon said

processor and to generate program code to perform a specific function of the server-side proxy;

and means for accessing said at least one module (see [0016], [0089]; EN: the mediator servlet is considered as a server-side proxy).

Blaukopf does not teach said module includes a datagram packet application interface configured to enable an application developer to specify a length of fragmentation and specify routine of fragmented data to a destination address and port number.

Sun teaches a datagram packet application interface configured to enable an application developer to specify a length of fragmentation and specify routine of fragmented data to a destination address and port number (see pages 1, 3, specifically, the constructor "public DatagramPacket (byte [] buf, int length, InetAddress address, int port).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Blaukopf to provide a datagram packet application interface configured to enable an application developer to specify a length of fragmentation and specify routine of fragmented data to a destination address and port number as taught by Sun because the developer specifies the protocol with which the mediate servlet is to communicate with remote service (see [0098] of Blaukopf) and APIs are well known in the art to expose encapsulated functionalities to developers.

5.   As per claim 4, Blaukopf further teaches the at least one module is configured to generate program code to extract text from a markup language document (see [0103]-[0105]).

6.   As per claim 7, Blaukopf further teaches the at least one module is configured to generate

program code to receive a request originating from the mobile device and generate a hypertext

transfer protocol request to an appropriate target (see Fig 1, Fig 2, [0088], [0117]).

7.   As per claim 9, Blaukopf further teaches the at least one module is configured to generate

program code to manipulate data strings for encoding and decoding data (see [0117]).

8.   As per claim 11, Blaukopf further teaches that the integrated development tool a plurality

of standardized Web Services Description Language documents, wherein each Web Services

Description Language Document corresponds to a particular domain (see [0090]).

9.   As per claim 13, Blaukopf teaches the invention as claimed, including a method of

constructing a server-side proxy for interacting with a wireless, mobile device (see Fig 1, Fig 2,

[0016]) comprising:

        receiving user input specifying attributes of the server-side proxy (see Fig 3, [0093]; EN:

the mediator servlet is considered as a server-side proxy);

        automatically generating program code specifying an architecture for the server-side

proxy according to the user specified attributes (see Fig 3, [0093], [0098]);

        wherein the program code is generated by a plurality of modules, each module configured

to generate code to perform a particular function of the server-side proxy (see Fig 3, [0098]).

        Blaukopf does not teach providing a datagram packet application interface configured to

enable an application developer to specify with the generated program code a length of

fragmentation of a data string and specify routine of fragmented data to a destination address and port number.

Sun teaches a datagram packet application interface configured to enable an application developer to specify with the generated program code a length of fragmentation of a data string and specify routine of fragmented data to a destination address and port number (see pages 1, 3, specifically, the constructor "public DatagramPacket (byte [] buf, int length, InetAddress address, int port).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Blaukopf to provide a datagram packet application interface configured to enable an application developer to specify with the generated program code a length of fragmentation of a data string and specify routine of fragmented data to a destination address and port number as taught by Sun because the developer specifies the protocol with which the mediate servlet is to communicate with remote service (see [0098] of Blaukopf) and APIs are well known in the art to expose encapsulated functionalities to developers.

10.   As per claims 14, 17, and 19, these are the method claims of claims 4, 7, and 9. Therefore, they are rejected using the same reasons as claims 4, 7, and 9.

11.   As per claims 22, 23, 26, and 28, these are the system claims of claims 13, 14, 17, and 19. Therefore, they are rejected using the same reasons as claims 13, 14. 17, and 19.

12.   As per claim 31, 32, 35, and 37, these are the machine readable storage claims of claims

13, 14, 17, and 19. Therefore, they are rejected using the same reasons as claims 13, 14. 17, and

19.

13.   Claims 2, 3, 10, 20, 29, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Blaukopf et al., (US 2004/0103407 A1, hereinafter Blaukopf), in view of Sun

Microsystems, "Java Platform 1.2 API Specification: Class DatagramPacket" (hereinafter Sun),

as applied to claims 1, 13, 22, and 31 above, further in view of Wahli et al., "Web Services

Wizardry with WebSphere Studio Application Developer" (hereinafter Wahli).

14.   As per claim 2, Blaukopf further teaches receiving user specified attributes of said server-

side proxy and automatically generate program code specifying a programmatic architecture for

the server-side proxy according to the user specified attributes (see Fig 3, [0092], [0093],

[0098]).

        Blaukopf and Sun do not teach a wizard module for receiving the user specified attributes

and that the wizard module controls the automatic generation of program code.

        Wahli teaches an integrated development tool for creating web applications (see page

xvii), including a wizard module for receiving the user specified attributes for generating a proxy

and the wizard module controls the automatic generation of program code (see 342-343, section

"Proxy Generation").

        It would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

have modified Blaukopf and Sun to provide a wizard module to receive the user specified

attributes and to control the automatic generation of program code as taught by Wahli because a

wizard is a well known user interface to provide users with step by step guidance in performing

tasks.

15.   As per claim 3, Blaukopf and Sun do not explicitly teach a toolbar having at least one

icon that can be activated via user input.

Wahli teaches an integrated development tool for creating web applications (see page

xvii), including a toolbar having at least one icon that can be activated via user input (see page

21).

It would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

have modified Blaukopf and Sun to provide a toolbar having at least one icon that can be

activated via user input as taught by Wahli because a toolbar is a well known user interface for

accessing functionality of the application.

16.   As per claim 10, Blaukopf and Sun do not teach that the integrated development tool

comprising a module configured to search a Universal Description, Discovery, and Integration

registry.

Wahli teaches an integrated development tool for creating web applications (see page

xvii), including a module configured to search a Universal Description, Discovery, and

Integration registry (see page 313, section "UDDI browser", page 395).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to have modified Blaukopf and Sun to include a module configured to search a Universal

Description, Discovery, and Integration registry as taught by Wahli because it allows the

developer to discover web services (see page 394 of Wahli).

17.   As per claim 20, this is the method claims of claim 10. Therefore, it is rejected using the

same reasons as claim 10.

18.   As per claim 29, this is the system claim of claim 10. Therefore, it is rejected using the

same reasons as claim 10.

19.   As per claim 38, this is the machine readable storage claim of claim 10. Therefore, it is

rejected using the same reasons as claim 10.

20.   Claims 5, 6, 8, 12, 15, 16, 18, 21, 24, 25, 27, 30, 33, 34, 36, and 39 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blaukopf et al., (US 2004/0103407 A1, hereinafter

Blaukopf), in view of Sun Microsystems, "Java Platform 1.2 API Specification: Class

DatagramPacket" (hereinafter Sun), as applied to claims 1, 13, 22, and 31 above, further in view

of Fox et al., "Adapting to Network and Client Variation Using Active Proxies: Lessons and

Perspectives" (hereinafter Fox).

21.   As per claim 5, Blaukopf and Sun do not teach that the least one module is configured to

generate program code to packetize data according to a type of wireless communications link

over which the data is to be sent.

Fox teaches a proxy for on the fly adaptation of data to mobile devices (see pages 1-2,

sections 1.1., 1.2), including program code to packetize data according to a type of wireless

communications link over which the data is to be sent (see page 1, section 1.1, page 3, left

column, bullet 2, page 4, left column, paragraph 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to have modified Blaukopf and Sun to generate program code to packetize data according to a

type of wireless communications link over which the data is to be sent as taught by Fox because

clients vary widely with respect to both hardware and software properties and these conditions

make it difficult for servers to provide a level of service that is appropriate for every client (see

page 1, abstract, section 1.1 of Fox).

22.   As per claim 6, Blaukopf and Sun do not teach that the at least one module is configured

to generate program code to convert images from a first graphics format to a second graphics

format, wherein the second graphics format is suitable for transmission over a wireless

communications link to a mobile device.

Fox teaches a proxy for on the fly adaptation of data to mobile devices (see pages 1-2,

sections 1.1., 1.2), including program code to convert images from a first graphics format to a

second graphics format, wherein the second graphics format is suitable for transmission over a

wireless communications link to a mobile device (see pages 2-3, section 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to have modified Blaukopf and Sun to generate program code to convert images from a first

graphics format to a second graphics format, wherein the second graphics format is suitable for

transmission over a wireless communications link to a mobile device as taught by Fox because clients vary widely with respect to both hardware and software properties and these conditions make it difficult for servers to provide a level of service that is appropriate for every client (see page 1, abstract, section 1.1 of Fox).

23.   As per claim 8, Blaukopf and Sun do not teach the at least one module is configured to generate program code to maintain user profiles within a data source accessible to the server-side proxy.

Fox teaches a proxy for on the fly adaptation of data to mobile devices (see pages 1-2, sections 1.1., 1.2), including program code to maintain user profiles within a data source accessible to the proxy (see page 6, left column, section 3.1, paragraph 1, page 7, Figure 4, right column, paragraph 4, page 8, left column, paragraph 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Blaukopf and Sun to generate program code to maintain user profiles within a data source accessible to the server-side proxy as taught by Fox because the user profiles stored in the customization database allows mass customization of request processing (see page 7, right column, paragraph 4 of Fox).

24.   As per claim 12, Blaukopf and Sun do not teach the at least one module is configured to generate program code to measure a quality of a communications link to the wireless, mobile device.

Fox teaches a proxy for on the fly adaptation of data to mobile devices (see pages 1-2,

sections 1.1., 1.2), including program code to measure a quality of a communications link to the

wireless, mobile device (see page 1, section 1.1, page 3, left column, bullet 2, page 4, left

column, paragraph 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to have modified Blaukopf and Sun to generate program code to measure a quality of a

communications link to the wireless, mobile device as taught by Fox because to reap the

maximum benefit from distillation, a distilled representation must target specific attributes of the

client and that distillation time is small and is compensated by reduction in overall transmission

time (see page 3, left column, bullet 2 of Fox).

25.   As per claims 15, 16, 18, and 21, these are method claims of claims 5, 6, 8, and 12.

Therefore, they are rejected using the same reasons as claims 5, 6, 8, and 12.

26.   As per claims 24, 25, 27, and 30, these are system claims of claims 5, 6, 8, and 12.

Therefore, they are rejected using the same reasons as claims 5, 6, 8, and 12.

27.   As per claim 33, 34, 36, and 39, these are machine readable storage claims of claims 5, 6,

8, and 12. Therefore, they are rejected using the same reasons as claims 5, 6, 8, and 12.

Response to Arguments

28.   <u>Rejection of claims under §102(e)</u>:

29.   As per claims independent claims 1, 13, 22, and 31, Applicants' arguments have been

fully considered and are moot in light of the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

30.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

   o   Smith et al. (US 7,017,162 B2) is cited to teach an application program interface for

       network software platform.

31.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP §706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

        A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

32.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Jue S. Wang whose telephone number is (571) 270-1655. The

examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7:30 am - 5:00pm (EST).

        If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Lewis Bullock can be reached on 571-272-3759. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

        Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Lewis A. Bullock, Jr./   Jue Wang
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2193   Examiner
                                                           Art Unit 2193